

REMARKS

In the present amendment, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, which depends from claim 1. Claim 2 is cancelled.

Claims 1-6 are amended for further clarity and for precision of language; this amendment is directed to form only. For example, claim 1 is amended to recite “wherein the plural kinds of organosiloxane derived composition units comprise at least a first organosiloxane with a cyclosiloxane backbone derived unit and a second organosiloxane with a straight-chain siloxane backbone derived unit.” Support may be found, for example, at paragraphs [0030] and [0032].

Claims 7 and 8 are cancelled.

New claim 9 is added. Claim 9 depends from claim 1 and recites that the bridge structure is formed by bonding the first organosiloxane and the second organosiloxane via an organic group. Support for the claim is found, for example, in the present specification at pages 21-22 and 40-42.

No new matter is added, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested. After entry of the Amendment, claims 1-6 and 9 will be pending.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 2 and 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and for indicating that claims 4-6 are allowable.

II. Applicant's Response to the Examiner's Objection to the Claims

On page 2 of the Action, the Examiner states that the claims would benefit from some revision because the claims are allegedly unnecessarily verbose. The Examiner also states that Applicant is at least required to replace the word comprises in line 4 of claim 1 with

“prepared/derived from” or some alternative because it is allegedly improper to state that a polymer comprises a monomer.

Without acquiescing in the merits of the objection, the claims have been amended for purposes of further clarity. Applicant submits that the present claims are clear and definite.

In addition, on page 3 of the Action, the Examiner requests that the word “ratio” be removed wherever it appears in the claims because the word “content” is allegedly clear.

Applicant disagrees that the word “ratio” should be removed.

Specifically, Applicant provides support for the phrase “content ratio” throughout the specification, and one of ordinary skill would understand the meaning and scope of the claim. Moreover, MPEP § 2111.01 states that an “applicant is entitled to be his or her own lexicographer.”

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner’s objections to the claims.

III. Applicant’s Response to the Examiner’s Claim Rejections

On page 4 of the Action, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0033373 to Rose et al.

Applicant submits that Rose does not disclose the organosiloxane copolymer film according to present claim 1.

Rose discloses a complex structure of cyclic silica and straight chain silica, which was considered by the Examiner to be equivalent to the structure recited by present claim 1. With all due respect, Applicant disagrees.

Rose's structure is obtained by silica bonding (-Si-O-). See, e.g., Rose at paragraph [0017]. For example, Rose's Figure 1 clearly illustrates that the cyclic and linear fragments are connected by silicon and oxygen. Further, Rose discloses that any organic groups that are present are connected as side groups. See, e.g., Rose at paragraphs [0027]-[0028].

On the other hand, according to the organosiloxane copolymer film disclosed by the present specification, a plasma copolymerization reaction (radical polymerization of a vinyl group) is employed to bond the cyclosiloxane backbone with the straight-chain siloxane backbone by means of carbon bonding (-C-C-).

Accordingly, Rose does not disclose or fairly suggest the copolymer film recited by the present claims.

Nonetheless, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, which depends from claim 1. Claim 2 is not subject to the present rejection and was indicated to be allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Rose does not disclose the copolymer film of claim 1 for the additional reason that Rose does not disclose a copolymer film having a film configuration in which a content ratio of the first organosiloxane backbone derived unit and the second organosiloxane with a straight-chain siloxane backbone derived unit is changing in the film thickness direction.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 1 based on Rose.

On page 4 of the Action, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,486,082 to Cho et al.

Without conceding to the merits of the rejection, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, which depends from claim 1. Claim 2 is not subject to the above rejection and was indicated as being allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Rose does not disclose the copolymer film of claim 1.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 1 based on Cho.

Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to new claim 9. Claim 9 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over the cited references at least by virtue of its dependency and additional elements recited therein.

IV. Conclusion

Allowance of claims 1 and 3-9 is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Registration No. 47,121 for
Howard L. Bernstein (Reg. No. 25,665)
Date: March 14, 2007

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER